

Obama “has comprehensively reconceptualized U.S. foreign policy with respect to several centrally important geopolitical issues

Obama’s Brzezinski Plan

By Ted Belman Thursday, January 14, 2010

In [Appraising Obama’s Foreign Policy: From Hope to Audacity](#), Zbigniew Brzezinski, described Obama’s, and his, world view which he characterized as “*reconnect(ing) the United States with the emerging historical context of the twenty-first century.*”

To this end, he writes Obama “has comprehensively reconceptualized U.S. foreign policy with respect to several centrally important geopolitical issues”. I shall comment on each of these in turn.

• ***Islam is not an enemy, and the “global war on terror” does not define the United States’ current role in the world;***

This has always been America’s policy. Even Bush 44, with his neocon stalwarts, refused, after 9/11, to identify the enemy as Islam. He avoided naming the enemy by declaring “war on terror”. He went so far as to declare Islam, “a religion of peace”.

What Obama has done differently was to publicly praise Islam, at the expense of truth and to bow down to its titular head, the King of Saudi Arabia. He has moved from tolerance to overt partnership.

But a form of partnership has existed between Britain, US and the Arab oil interests ever since last century’s thirties. The British worked with the Arabs in the Middle East to thwart Germany’s expansion there all at the expense of Jewish settlement rights. In the late seventies Britain, with the complicity of the US brought about the downfall of the Shah because the Shah wanted to have an independent oil policy and not one controlled by Britain.

According to [“A Century Of War: Anglo-American Oil Politics and the New World Order”](#), by William Engdahl, a German historian.

Their scheme was based on a detailed study of the phenomenon of Islamic fundamentalism, as presented by British Islamic expert, Dr. Bernard Lewis, then on assignment at Princeton University in the United States. Lewis’s scheme, which was unveiled at the May 1979 Bilderberg meeting in Austria, endorsed the radical Muslim Brotherhood movement behind Khomeini, in order to promote balkanization of the entire Muslim Near East along tribal and religious lines. Lewis argued that the West should encourage autonomous groups such as the Kurds, Armenians, Lebanese Maronites, Ethiopian Copts, Azerbaijani Turks, and so forth. The chaos would spread in what he termed an ‘Arc of Crisis,’ which would spill over into Muslim regions of the Soviet Union.

So not only was this scheme intended to protect British oil interests in Iran, it was also intended to put pressure on the Soviets.

In a [Counterpunch](#) translation of interview of Zbigniew Brzezinski in Le Nouvel Observateur (France) 1998, Brzezinski took pride in having brought on the Russian defeat in Afghanistan by supporting “some stirred up Moslems”, the Mujahedeen, and dismissed the idea that “Islamic fundamentalism represents a world menace today”. He said,.

Nonsense! It is said that the West had a global policy in regard to Islam. That is stupid. There isn't a global Islam. Look at Islam in a rational manner and without demagoguery or emotion. It is the leading religion of the world with 1.5 billion followers. But what is there in common among Saudi Arabian fundamentalism, moderate Morocco, Pakistan militarism, Egyptian pro-Western or Central Asian secularism? Nothing more than what unites the Christian countries.

Pres Reagan continued this policy of working with Islamic fundamentalists when he rescued Arafat and his minions from total destruction by the IDF in Beirut. What other reason could there have been other than to use them one day to put pressure on Israel to return to the '67 armistice lines.

Present Clinton also co-opted Islamic fundamentalist, this time from Kosovo, to dismember Serbia in order to reduce the power of Russia.

Obama's policies totally reflect this mentality in his downplaying the "war on terror" and overplaying "engagement". Obama wants to deal with each Moslem country as though it was not part of the whole of them, as though they aren't all followers of Islam as represented by the Koran or "The Holy Koran" as he refers to it.

Saudi Arabian fundamentalism has invaded Pakistan, Afghanistan, Yemen, Europe, US and parts of Africa. It has influenced the Muslim Brotherhood which is attempting to overthrow Egypt. Al Qaeda is an outgrowth of such fundamentalism. Iran with its Shiite brand of Islamic fundamentalism has taken over Syria, Lebanon, and Gaza at least politically if not religiously. Iraq with its 60% Shiite population could fall to them and already Turkey is cozying up to them.

Yet Brzezinski and Obama maintain "Islam is not an enemy" even while the fundamentalists and the Arab street attack America as the Great Satan and not Russia.

Remember that Brzezinski was a founder the Trilateral Commission along with Rockefeller, is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations in New York and has attended meetings of the Bilderberg Group. Thus he strongly favours World Government and its institutions as does Obama. Nation states, such as Israel, are in their way. They find common cause with Islam because Islam too favours its own version of world government, namely, the Caliphate.

• the United States will be a fair-minded and assertive mediator when it comes to attaining lasting peace between Israel and Palestine;

This conflict is so politicized as to make it impossible for anyone to be "fair minded" or "even handed" or any other liberal balm. While these notions sound great, they both ignore the facts and the law. You cannot do this and reach a "just" solution.

The US and Britain are just as determined to undermine Israel as they were the Shah and for the same reason, oil. How can they be "fair minded" or trusted?

"assertive mediator" is an oxymoron. Mediation is not arbitration. The role of the mediator is to help the parties reconcile their differences without coercion. To assertively mediate is to coerce. Obama certainly has been coercive to Israel. But all US administrations have been coercive to varying degrees. The difference being that [Obama intends to impose a solution](#) if he can.

Brzezinski and Obama propose that

1. "Jerusalem has to be shared, and shared genuinely".
2. "a settlement must be based on the 1967 lines, but with territorial swaps"
3. "US or NATO station troops along the Jordon River".
4. "Palestinian refugees should not be granted the right of return to what is now Israel."

He argues that

"It is important to remember that although the Israeli and Palestinian populations are almost equal in

number, under the 1967 lines the Palestinian territories account for only 22 percent of the old British mandate, whereas the Israeli territories account for 78 percent.”

How could a man of his experience be so wrong. Israel together with Judea, Samaria and Gaza comprise 22% of the Mandate. The rest was given to Jordan in 1922. Now the international community wants Israel to divide up the 22% remaining, leaving even less for Israel than the 22%.

He wants the refugees “to be resettled within the Palestinian state. They number in the many millions. How could Judea and Samaria possibly accommodate them. Imagine how destabilizing that would be. I venture to say that the present Arab inhabitants would be the most vociferous opponents to such an influx.

Would it not be a better solution to resettle them all in Jordan. Not only is Jordan Palestine, its population is 60% Palestinian. Thus there would be no need to divide Jerusalem or put foreign troops along the Jordan.

• the United States ought to pursue serious negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program, as well as other issues;

The US, even under Bush, has been unwilling to really challenge Iran, preferring to talk them out of their agenda. Obama made engagement with Iran, a political platform. After a year of trying to engage Iran in a most humiliating manner, he has achieved nothing. And yet Brzezinski is still beating the same drum. Give it up already.

What might the “other issues” be? Presumably, Middle East hegemony.

How much hegemony is he or Obama prepared to concede? If none or very little, there is no point in negotiations. Besides, what would Saudi Arabia and Egypt have to say about this, to say nothing about Israel.

Brzezinski argues

But it is still possible, perhaps through a more intrusive inspection regime, to fashion a reasonably credible arrangement that prevents weaponization.

It would not be conducive to serious negotiations if the United States were to persist in publicly labeling Iran as a terrorist state, as a state that is not to be trusted, as a state against which sanctions or even a military option should be prepared.

Sanctions must punish those in power — not the Iranian middle class, as an embargo on gasoline would do. The unintended result of imposing indiscriminately crippling sanctions would likely be to give the Iranians the impression that the United States’ real objective is to prevent their country from acquiring even a peaceful nuclear program — and that, in turn, would fuel nationalism and outrage.

Obama is following this prescription to a “T”, without good results I might add. He is even unwilling to seriously support the opposition with words to say nothing of deeds.

• the counterinsurgency campaign in the Taliban-controlled parts of Afghanistan should be part of a larger political undertaking, rather than a predominantly military one;

He wants to engage with “receptive elements of the Taliban” arguing that “the Taliban are not a global revolutionary or terrorist movement, ... they do not directly threaten the West.” But they do host al Qaeda who is a threat.

His prescription is to enlist the majority Afghans to defeat them. Does this not oppose the idea of engaging them? Will this plan work? The US has been trying for the last five years or so to build up Iraqi forces to maintain order. Many believe that were the US to withdraw from Iraq as Obama intends, that the Iraqi forces would not be able to do so. So much more so, for Afghanistan.

Brzezinski recognizes that the support of Pakistan is a prerequisite but recognizes how difficult this would be.

Given that many Pakistanis may prefer a Taliban-controlled Afghanistan to a secular Afghanistan that

leans toward Pakistan's archival, India, the United States needs to assuage Pakistan's security concerns in order to gain its full cooperation in the campaign against the irreconcilable elements of the Taliban.

Will this result in ceding Afghanistan to the fundamentalists? Pakistan wants to focus the war in Afghanistan rather than Pakistan and thus has different objectives to those of the US. So the US will have to reconcile her objectives with those of the Pakistani's, to gain their cooperation.

• ***the United States should respect Latin America's cultural and historical sensitivities and expand its contacts with Cuba;***

Is that another way of saying that the US should accept that they are socialists?

• ***the United States ought to energize its commitment to significantly reducing its nuclear arsenal and embrace the eventual goal of a world free of nuclear weapons;***

Coming from the master of real politique, that's quite a fantasy.

• ***in coping with global problems, China should be treated not only as an economic partner but also as a geopolitical one;***

• ***improving U.S.-Russian relations is in the obvious interest of both sides, although this must be done in a manner that accepts, rather than seeks to undo, post-Cold War geopolitical realities; and***

• ***a truly collegial transatlantic partnership should be given deeper meaning, particularly in order to heal the rifts caused by the destructive controversies of the past few years.***

Quite a workload.

CFP Tools

Share 40

| [More](#)

(0) [Reader Feedback](#)

[Subscribe](#)

[Print friendly](#)

[Contact Us](#)

Ted Belman [Bio](#) **Ted Belman** [Most recent columns](#)

Ted Belman is a retired lawyer and Editor of israpundit.com. He made aliyah from Canada in 2009 and now lives in Jerusalem.

Ted can be reached at: [\[email\]tedbel@rogers.com\[/email\]](mailto:tedbel@rogers.com)

Printed from:
<http://www.canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/18951>